

REMARKS

Independent Claims 1 and 13 are amended to define over the applied art. Claims 30-40 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-29 remain in this application, with no claim previously allowed.

Independent Claims 1 and 13 stand rejected as unpatentable over *Walsh* (US 6,662,014). The Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection, especially as possibly applied to the amended claims.

Claim 1 now defines a method for providing location query service as discussed in the Applicants' specification at page 4, lines 15-22 and, e.g., at page 16, lines 1-13. Namely, the method responds to a location query by determining whether the requestor is authorized to receive the requested location information. If the requestor is authorized, the location information of the wireless network user is forwarded to the requestor.

However, if the requestor is *not authorized*, the method of Claim 1 determines whether the wireless network user will accept requests to release location information to unauthorized users. If not, the method returns a message informing the requestor that the request is denied. If the wireless network user *does* accept location-information requests from unauthorized users, the method forwards to the user the identification of the requestor seeking the location information. If the wireless network user chooses not to release the requested location information to that unauthorized user, the method returns a denial message to the requestor. However, if the wireless network user does choose to release the requested location information to the unauthorized user, the method retrieves that location information and forwards the information to the requestor.

Claim 1 thus now defines a method for providing a location query service in which authorized requestors can receive location information about a wireless network user, and wherein an *unauthorized* user *may* receive such information if authorization is approved by the wireless user on a case-by-case basis.

Walsh fails to disclose or suggest a method comprising the limitations, as well as the overall operational combination of such limitations, now in Claim 1. At the outset of a request for location information, that reference determines whether the request is from a "location privacy manager 106 or a location-enabled device 108" (column 6, lines 49-52). If the location privacy manager prevails, *Walsh* then determines whether or not a particular wireless device (not the requestor) is registered with that manager. If the wireless device is not registered, the request for location information is rejected (column 6, lines 63-67) and the method ends.

If the location request is from a location-enabled service 108, the wireless communication device according to *Walsh* determines whether or not the identity *of that location-enabled service* is acceptable (column 7, lines 6-10). If the identity of that service is not acceptable to the wireless communication device, the location request is rejected and the method ends.

Walsh thus teaches an either-or approach to processing requests for location information. Either the wireless communication device (not the requestor) is registered with a location-privacy manager, or the request must come from a location-enabled service. The present method as defined in Claim 1, in contrast with *Walsh*, determines whether the requestor is authorized to receive location information. Furthermore, even if a requestor is not authorized, the method of Claim 1 looks to see whether the particular

user will accept requests to release location information. If so, and if the user chooses to release that information to the particular requestor, the requested location information is forwarded to the requestor. In the present invention, a requestor *may* be able to receive location information of a particular user even where that requestor is not on a list of authorized requestors.

One of ordinary skill, knowing of *Walsh* but not of the present invention, does not find in *Walsh* any teaching or suggestion of the method as now defined in Claim 1. That method is contrary to the either -or approach taught by *Walsh*. Accordingly, that claim and the dependent claims are patentable over *Walsh*.

Amended Claim 13 defines a system for providing a location query service. The system limitations in Claim 13 are analogous to the method limitations currently in Claim 1 and as discussed above. For the same reasons, *Walsh* fails to disclose or suggest a system comprising those limitations. Accordingly, Claim 13 and the claims depending therefrom define patentable subject matter over *Walsh*.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD


Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: August 9, 2005

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

